

### REMARKS

#### **35 U.S.C. 103**

The examiner rejected claims 1-15, 19-23, 25-27, and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Nowitz et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,308,464(Nowitz), in view of Hu (U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2003/0182408 (Hu), further in view of Beyer et al. U.S. Publication No. 2003/0135487(Beyer).

#### Claim 1

No proper combination of Nowitz, Hu and Beyer discloses or renders obvious “analyzing the first set of content files for errors by emulating the first category of wireless devices... the error information indicative of incorrect display on the first category of wireless devices,” as recited by amended independent claim 1.

As the Examiner correctly points out, “Nowitz does not explicitly state analyzing the first set of content files for errors by emulating the first category of devices.” (Office Action, p. 4). The Examiner relies on Hu to disclose this feature. However, Hu merely discloses a system which simulates a load test on a web server. Hu does not analyze the content files at all. Hu teaches away from analyzing the content files. In this regard, Hu states:

Through aspects of the present invention, communications (requests and responses) exchanged between a client and a server are simulated by a thread. **Because, the request/response pairs are not actually created and processed by each virtual user, the load tester system of the present invention can be designed lightly.** Moreover because the load tester system relies primarily on the message file and configuration file to test various scenarios, the tester need only capture a new trace (and create a new message file) to run a new test. (Hu, [0041], emphasis added)

Because Hu does not actually process the response from the server, Hu cannot be construed to teach: “analyzing the first set of content files for errors by emulating a first category

of wireless devices” as recited by claim 1, let alone that the error information is indicative of incorrect display on the first category of wireless devices.

Similarly, Beyer does not disclose or suggest “analyzing the first set of content files for errors displaying the first set of content on a first category of wireless devices by emulating the first category of wireless devices... the error information indicative of incorrect display on the first category of wireless devices.” Instead, Beyer discloses a system of analyzing log files generated from real users accessing the Web. In this regard, Beyer states:

First, log files are maintained of the communications between a Web browser and a Web server resulting from real users accessing the Web databases through interactions with an HTML form (step 100). This log information is analyzed and reasonable parameter combinations are chosen for subsequent crawling (step 102). (Beyer, [0025]).

Beyer neither describes nor would render obvious “analyzing the first set of content files for errors displaying the first set of content on a first category of wireless devices by emulating a first category of wireless devices ... the error information indicative of incorrect display on the first category of wireless devices.” as recited by claim 1.

#### Claims 19, 25, and 29

Claims 19, 25, and 29 recite analogous limitations to independent claim 1 and are allowable for at least similar reasons.

#### Dependent Claims 2-15, 20-23, 26-27, and 30-31

Each of the dependent claims is also believed to define patentable features of the invention and are allowable at least for the reasons given in their corresponding independent claims and, as such, has not been discussed specifically herein.

#### Dependent Claims 16-18, 24, 28, and 32

The examiner rejected claims 16-18,24,28,32 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nowitz, in view Hu, further in view of Beyer, and in further view of Sheth et al (US Pat 6,311,194) [hereinafter Sheth].

No proper combination of Nowitz, Hu, Beyer, and Sheth discloses or renders obvious the subject matter of claims 1, 19, 25, and 32 found to be lacking in Nowitz, Hu, and Beyer. Claims 16-18, 24, 28, and 32 are properly dependent on claims 1, 19, 25, and 32, respectively, and are patentable therewith.

This Reply is accompanied by a Request for Continued Examination.

The \$1,110 Petition for Extension of Time fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account Authorization.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 08575-0103001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 22, 2010

/Jeffrey D. Weber/

Jeffrey D. Weber  
Reg. No. 64,828

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945